DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 510 HE 008 109

TITLE	Changing Tasks and Roles in Higher Education. The Austin College Total Institutional Project. Final Report of the Advisory Panel.
INSTITUTION	Austin Coll., Sherman, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY	National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, D.C.; National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 75
GRANT	ED71-28-72459; GY-10413
NOTE	32p.; For related document, see HE C08 112
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Development; Educational Objectives; *General Education; *Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; *Liberal Arts; *Private Colleges; *Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The comprehensive nature of the Total Institutional Project required a diversity of specialities and points of view. An advisory panel was encouraged to investigate any aspect of Austin College's program that it felt was relevant to the overall purposes of the project. The panel was able to gain a great deal of understanding concerning the elements of the project, the factors that appear to influence these elements, and the general significance of the total program. This final report of the advisory panel is organized around these program elements and major factors that appear to be of special significance. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125510

HE

FINAL REPORT

Of

THE ADVISORY PANEL

To The

AUSTIN COLLEGE TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 008 109

Dr. Horace Hartsell
Dr. Harold L. Hodgkinson
Dr. Wayne H. Holtzman
Dr. John W. Macy
Dr. Frederic W. Ness
Dr. Martha E. Peterson
Dr. Jack W. Powers
Mrs. Edith W. Seashore
Dr. Joseph F. Wall

AC

Sherman, Texas-founded 1849

THE AUSTIN COLLEGE TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT

CHANGING TASKS AND ROLES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

June 1972 - November 1975

National Science Foundation National Endowment for the Humanities

FINAL REPORT

of

THE ADVISORY PANEL

NEH Development Grant #ED71-28-72459
NSF CoSIP Institutional Grant #GY-10413

PREFACE

In 1972 Austin College, a private liberal arts college of 1200 students, presented jointly to the National Endowment for the Humanities and to the National Science Foundation a proposal for a Total Institutional Project on Changing Tasks and Roles in Higher Education. Both agencies responded with support for the Project designed to install a new educational program to facilitate more active and individualized learning roles for students, more responsive roles for faculty, and development of strategies of continuing self-renewal for the College. Both agencies participated with the College in the selection of an Advisory Panel of nine nationally prominent educators of varied expertise to serve for ongoing consultation, evaluation, and liaison for a three-year period beginning near the end of the first year of the Project.

The Advisory Panel of the Austin College Total Institutional Project represented a significant experiment in consultant relationships. This dynamic Panel served the Austin College Project in a variety of ways within a collective and continuing relationship over a three year period. This preface to the Final Report of the Advisory Panel has been prepared by Austin College in an attempt to point out specifically the range of the contributions of the Panel to the various parts and phases of the Project and the impact of this distinctive type of consultative process.

The six semi-annual meetings of the Panel on the Austin College campus were significant landmarks in the development of the Project. Each meeting had an impact rather like a site visit from a sponsoring agency because of the Panel's liaison role. These meetings, other visits of individual Panelists, and various forms of correspondence provided a continuous oversight capable of identifying any major problems that might have arisen. The impression of being checked out in semi-annual visits made the Project and College staff more alert to potential problems and probably prevented some from materializing.

The Panel's series of meetings provided a rhythm and discipline for the Project staff in the preparation and follow-up for each meeting. In these meetings the Panelists provided a broader critique for testing ideas and creative approaches and for examining options before actions were taken. The continuity of the relationship of the Panel to the Project made possible a significant development of their understanding of the institutional context and of the people involved in dealing with the complex educational issues of the Project, so that their advice and insights became more and more valuable through the three-year period. To understand the nature of this developing relationship it is helpful to review the principal activities of the series of Panel meetings.

Meeting I: May 1-2, 1973. The first meeting of the Advisory Panel was necessarily organizational in emphasis. Three Panelists who were unable to attend this meeting were specially introduced to the Project in visits during the 1973 Summer Resource Laboratory (SRL). Representatives of the NSF were present

at the inaugural meeting. The NEH did not send a representative, but its critical support was specially acknowledged. John Macy was installed as Chairman of the Panel. (Subsequently, Dr. Macy had to withdraw from the Chairman's role for reasons of health, and Wayne Holtzman was named Chairman.) The Panel reviewed the progress of the first year of the Project including the 1972 SRL and plans for the 1973 SRL. As part of its next meeting, the Panel decided to experience the Birkman Seminar, a personality profile with which none of the Panel members were familiar.

Meeting II: October 1-2, 1973. For the second meeting all Panelists were present except John Macy who was ill. Each had the opportunity to complete a Birkman questionnaire prior to the meeting, and a mini-Seminar was conducted by Birkman personnel to give the Panelists the results of their questionnaires and to demonstrate the technique. Panelists' reactions to the Birkman experience varied. Action was taken at this meeting to have the developing work on the Birkman examined more closely by the Panel in its future meetings. Other activities included presentations and discussions reviewing the 1973 SRL.

Meeting III: April 29-30, 1974. Six Panelists attended the third meeting. Most of the first day was devoted to a review of College developments and the progress of the Project, including plans for the 1974 SRL. Special emphasis was on reports from the three Resource Service Units, and the faculty and student reports on the impact of the Project on the curriculum of the Humanities, Science, and Social Science Areas. Student-directed projects also received attention, including a Policy Research group and a Student-Originated Studies program. The second day began with a comprehensive discussion by the Panel and College staff members on evaluation and reporting of the Project. This discussion formed a basis for the Project's overall evaluation plan later developed and submitted to the funding agencies. Time was provided for various conferences of Panel members with students and faculty. The Panel then held a working session on the Birkman Method and plans for its adaptation. Drs. Roger Birkman and Roy Mefferd presented a Technical Report and answered questions. The decision was made that the College staff would work closely with them in adapting the Birkman materials for use with college students.

Meeting IV: December 5-7, 1974. Building on the Panel's increasing understanding Austin College and the Total Institutional Project, this meeting was even more of a working session than the previous ones. Six Panelists attended. Reporting to the Panel concerned a recent NEH site visitation and possibilities for the Panel to hold its next meeting in conjunction with the Austin College 125th Anniversary Commission, a special group helping the College celebrate and acknowledge 125 years of service and operation. Evaluation was a theme of this meeting. In discussions with the two candidates for employment as in-depth interviewers, the Panel helped to refine plans concerning sampling, interviewing techniques, and schedule. The Panelists also became involved directly in evaluation by accepting individual assignments to prepare interim evaluations on various features of the Project. Panelists engaged in conferences on the various

topics, and each prepared a written report on two or three of the topics. Between conferences, Panelists visited classes. The Panel also decided to contract with the two prospective interviewers as a team to conduct the in-depth interviews for evaluation of the Project, and agreed to participate in the spring meeting of the 125th Anniversary Commission.

Meeting V: April 25-26, 1975. Much of Meeting V was devoted to reviewing plans and activities underway for evaluation and reporting of the Project and for continuing the thrust of the Project after outside funding ended. Seven Panelists were present. Special attention was given to the in-depth interviews then in progress, with the Panel meeting in executive session with one of the interviewers. The Panel also discussed its own functions and outlined its responsibilities for the remainder of the Project. A draft of an interim report to NEH and NSF, composed primarily of the status reports written by Panelists at Meeting IV, was reviewed and approved for submission to the funding agencies. On the second day, the Panel met with the Austin College Board of Trustees to hear presentations from the 125th Anniversary Commission.

Meeting VI: November 5-6, 1975. This two-day meeting concluded the involvement of the Panel with the Project. Purposes of the meeting centered on the Panelists' evaluation of the Project, and the reporting of that evaluation to the Austin College campus community. Considerable time was devoted to discussion of the Panel's final written report and of procedures for bringing it to completion. In addition, the Panel gave its conclusions to the College community through an open forum in which the Panel reported its findings to students, faculty, staff, and trustees. As in each previous meeting there were also conferences of individual panelists with different College and Project leaders in matters of the Panelists' special interests and expertise.

Individual Contributions of Panel Members

In addition to their functions as a group, each member of the Panel provided a distinctive resource of experience and advice, as the following selection of topics indicates:

Horace Hartsell: Instructional design as the appropriate context and strategy for educational media

Bud Hodgkinson: Educational research in its broad social context--how to know what is really happening, to take its measure, and to use that information

Wayne Holtzman: Tests and measurements; the psychological impact of experimental programs and processes; leadership as Chairman of the Panel

John Macy: College governance and administration; developing a useful record of Project activities

Fred Ness: The national context of liberal arts colleges--their roles now and in the future, and what is needed for filling the needs of the future

Martha Peterson: Maintaining the identity and function of a college; the responsibilities of educational leaders in regard to the pressures and concerns faced by students, including those related to the changing status of women

Jack Powers: The interest of the scientific community seen broadly in its application to education, including the professional development of faculty in the sciences and social sciences

Edie Seashore: The key role of interpersonal relationships in the classroom and in educational administration, and even within such a group as the Advisory Panel

Joe Wall: Maintaining the traditional values of the breadth of the liberal arts and the satisfactions of academe while adapting to a changing educational context.

Roles and Impact of the Panel

In their collective function, the most important contributions of the Panel to the effort represented in the Project had to do on the one hand with evaluation and planning, and on the other hand with communication and involvement. The purposes of the Panel for consultation and for liaison with the funding agencies were always important, but the need for acquainting them with the program and project of Austin College prompted an early emphasis on communication and opportunities for involvement.

As a group, the Panel represented to Austin College the external community of higher education and helped the College learn to communicate better with that external community. They were an active and probing audience for the College's written and oral attempts to inform them about the program and project. Their questions helped sharpen the articulation of goals, principles, and procedures as they asked for clarifications, asked why we were doing this and not that, challenged us concerning the practicality of some of our ambitions, and confirmed and restated many of our commitments. Some people at Austin College were at first awed by this very distinguished group looking over our shoulders, but this soon changed to a feeling of "we're all in this together," as the Panel's warmth, directness, and understanding of our task became evident to all.

An equally important but somewhat more difficult role to explain was the "third-party" role filled by the Advisory Panel. Occasions for informing the Panel in oral presentations were deliberately managed so that they also served

to inform and update the rest of the Austin College community, or as many as could reasonably be gathered for the event. Their role on such occasions was that of communication catalyst, helping to gain the attention and understanding of the rest of the audience. At a slightly subtler level, their role seemed also to be a catalyst for attitudinal change as well--the evidence of their interest seeming to trigger a latent sense of commitment, or to confirm and strengthen an already active one, on the part of some of the faculty in the audience.

Evaluation in the project was designed to be formative and to serve the planning of what should be done next. For this reason, the functions of the Advisory Panel relative to evaluation began with their first meeting, or even before that with the written materials sent to them as background for that meeting. Even their Final Report that follows this Preface has a developmental emphasis, reviewing what has been accomplished (and what has not) as information useful for further planning. Besides numerous incidental contributions to the Project's evaluation efforts, the Panel was closely involved in the development of a general plan for summative evaluation, undertook responsibility for supervising the In-Depth Interview procedure, and prepared an Interim Report as well as this Final Report.

It should be kept in mind that while the Final Report of the Advisory Panel was written during fall term 1975, some of the Panel's conclusions are based largely on earlier observations, such as the in-depth interviews. Their findings thus represent a "snapshot" taken at a particular time for a continually developing, changing program. In several instances, subsequent to the Panel's observations there have been developments which have substantially changed the programs involved.

Because the Total Institutional Project represented comprehensive, total change of an institution, the Advisory Panel looked at all aspects of the College, its programs, structure, and environment. This broad approach to review and evaluation turned out to be very helpful. In a few collateral areas outside the Total Institutional Project per se (and not funded by either NEH or NSF), the observations of the Panel in their final report are based on very limited and sometimes premature feedback.

Two significant instances may be cited. In the report there are reservations about the "faculty personnel program." After the Panel's report was prepared in December 1975, substantial funding was obtained for the Faculty Career Development Program, which now is well underway. The College's faculty personnel program and the Career Development Program are now installed, and are being well received by faculty. Similarly, the Panel's observations on governance reflect their limited involvement with some recent developments. Installation of the governance structure at the level of the individual programs was proposed but was not fully implemented until funding was obtained through a foundation grant in the summer of 1975. Implementing this "grass-roots" participation at the program level is already producing a needed balance in the whole complex structure for shared governance.

If there was one contribution of the Panel that was more important than any other, it was the clear message that others cared deeply about the kinds of issues Austin College was attempting to deal with through its Total Institutional Project. The fact that such distinguished and busy people were willing to invest their time and energy in our project--and did so with obvious enthusiasm--had a tremendous and positive impact in heightening the sense of commitment of members of the Austin College community.

We at Austin College are pleased that this Preface to the Advisory Panel's Final Report gives us a special opportunity to express our gratitude for the important contribution made by the Advisory Panel as a group and individually. We deeply appreciate their firmness as well as their patience with us, their probing inquiries as well as their encouragement.

John D. Moseley
President and Project Director
Austin College
Sherman, Texas

THE AUSTIN COLLEGE TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT

CHANGING TASKS AND ROLES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

June 1972 - November 1975

National Science Foundation

National Endowment for the Humanities

FINAL REPORT OF THE ADVISORY PANEL

December, 1975

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY PANEL

Dr. Horace Hartsell
Director, Instructional Development Services
University of Texas at Houston Dental Branch
Houston, Texas 77025

[3]Dr. Harold L. Hodgkinson, Director
National Institute of Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20208

Dr. Wayne H. Holtzman (Chairman)
President, Hogg Foundation for Mental Health
The University of Texas
Austin, Texas 78712

[1,2,3] Dr. John W. Macy (The original Chairman of the Panel whose illness prevented his continuing in that capacity)
1127 Langly Lane
McLean, Virginia 22101

[1]Dr. Frederic W. Ness, President
Association of American Colleges
Washington, D. C. 20009

[1,3]Dr. Martha E. Peterson
President, Beloit College
Beloit, Wisconsin 53511

Dr. Jack W. Powers
Vice President-Program Support
Research Corporation
405 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10017

[3]Mrs. Edith W. Seashore
Private Consultant - Psychologist
Washington, D. C. 20007

[2]Dr. Joseph F. Wall
Parker Professor of History
Grinnell College
Grinnell, Iowa 50112

---

[1]Unable to attend Meeting IV

[2]Unable to attend Meeting V

[3]Unable to attend Meeting VI

INTRODUCTION

The concept of an Advisory Panel was first proposed by the National Science Foundation as part of the evaluation component for the Total Institutional Project. In the final stages of negotiation with the two sponsors, it was agreed that the Advisory Panel should not only observe and advise the faculty and staff of Austin College but should also provide some kind of liaison with the two sponsoring agencies. Many different factors were considered in developing a list of nominees for the Panel. The nine-member Panel as finally constituted in the spring of 1973, consisted of individuals representing a number of different disciplines, private foundations, specialized professional schools, national associations, college administration, educational technology, organizational theory and human relations. The unusually comprehensive nature of the Total Institutional Project required a diversity of specialties and points of view only rarely encompassed within a single advisory group. The Panel was encouraged by Austin College to investigate any aspect of the College's program that it felt was relevant to the overall purposes of the project.

Limited to two meetings a year for the three years of the project's duration, the Advisory Panel was unable to make a searching inquiry. And yet, by deploying its resources and specializing on occasion, the Panel was able to gain a great deal of understanding concerning the elements of the project, the factors that appear to influence these elements, and the general significance of the total program. This final report of the Advisory Panel is organized around these program elements and major factors that appear to be of special significance. A detailed description of the Advisory Panel meetings, as well as individual consultations rendered by

members of the Panel on special occasions, are presented elsewhere.

Some general observations will be presented first, followed by a more detailed evaluation of specific program elements that together comprise the Total Institutional Project.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

Goals of the Project and of Austin College

All members of the Advisory Panel were enthusiastic about the general goals of the Total Institutional Project. While many of the individual elements of the program have been attempted elsewhere, moving forward with new ideas on so many different fronts at once in order to deal with all aspects of a changing institution is indeed an exciting concept. Even though most of the goals represent abstractions which cannot ever be perfectly attainable, this in no way lessens the importance of the exercise involved in their formulation and pursuit. As will be evident in a more detailed review of specific program elements, the College has not reached all of its initially formulated goals. Nevertheless, specific achievements have been impressive. The faculty and staff of the College, as well as student leaders, have gone about their work in a very systematic fashion and all of them are to be congratulated.

It is important for Austin College to set new goals for the next period in its development program. These also should be far reaching in nature even though they may not be completely attainable in an ideal sense. There is a danger that the current faculty and staff will feel exhausted by the

tremendous efforts of the past three years. Sufficiently realistic goals should be established, together with fairly concrete subgoals, that progress can be recognized throughout the campus community.

One of the most impressive aspects of the project to date has been the progress made in getting the faculty and the students to work enthusiastically together. This collaboration has been achieved at a high level and represents a major strength at Austin College that is only rarely found in other institutions. The success of the program to date may have resulted not so much from the dollar resources as from the human resources which, to a quite remarkable degree, were willingly donated by both faculty and administration.

Reporting on the Austin College Experience

Austin College should make every effort to share its experience with other institutions. The greatest use to other colleges will be an evaluation of why some particular program was undertaken, what goals were set for it, and an honest evaluation of what has happened. It would be helpful to single out each element of the Total Institutional Project and prepare a a general statement for distribution or discussion. If done with complete candor and emphasizing programs that have not been successful as well as those which have been judged to be highly successful, such statements should be invaluable to other colleges interested in profiting from this comprehensive demonstration project. Brief descriptions and impressions concerning the value of many of these program elements, as seen through the eyes of the Advisory Panel, are presented later in this report.

Any dissemination of results must be done with appropriate modesty. Inevitably, at least some other colleges will start from the point of view that they could have done even better with the large grant of money made

available by the sponsors.

In addition to written documents of various kinds, a general conference in the spring of 1976 would make it possible for representatives from interested colleges to engage in an intensive exchange with their faculty counterparts at Austin College. Only in this way can the less tangible aspects of the Total Institutional Project be successfully communicated to outsiders. The subtle but important ways in which the many specific elements of the project interrelate in a synergistic manner can best be appreciated by total immersion in planned activities at Austin College.

The Advisory Panel as an Experiment in Consultant Relationships.

The Advisory Panel was originally conceived as a way of providing outside continual advice and support from a national perspective. On occasion where appropriate, the Panel could also serve as a liaison mechanism between Austin College and the two national agencies providing financial support for the project. For these reasons, the Panel has always preserved its integrity as an independent body. The liaison role to the National Science Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities never fully materialized, probably because there were no specific issues or crises that required such a relationship. Although it has met only twice a year, the Panel has served as a sounding board for many of the activities at Austin College and has taken an active part in designing the evaluation for the project.

The Advisory Panel played an important role in assuming responsibility for the confidential in-depth interviews of all faculty members and a sample of students. Drs. Adreain Ross and Charles Tesar collected a great deal of important information in these interviews. In this way, no faculty member or administrator at Austin College had access to any of the confidential information collected, an important provision to insure complete candor and to

protect the privacy of the individuals interviewed. While such confidential interviews might have been carried out by a third party contractor, the present arrangement proved to be ideal from every point of view.

Individual members of the Advisory Panel provided additional consultation in areas of their specialization. Several Panel members made special trips to Austin College for this purpose, particularly in connection with the summer resource laboratories.

Several members of the Advisory Panel felt that their contributions might have been more significant if there had been an opportunity for more frequent visits to the campus. With only two meetings a year each of short duration, the agenda for a given meeting was too heavily packed with structured events. Each member of the Panel regretted that there wasn't a greater opportunity to visit classes, talk to faculty and students, and experience many of the elements at firsthand. Too often, judgments made by the Panel members had to be based upon secondhand information or predigested summaries. At the same time, it must be recognized that all members of the Advisory Panel had heavy schedules of other work which prevented their becoming involved on the Austin College campus in any deep sense of the word. For these reasons the Panel may not have been as effective as it might have become, given more time and resources.

In any event, it is important to recognize the symbolic value of the Advisory Panel in serving as a catalyst for the project participants. The very existence of the Panel heightened the degree of preparation and evaluation on the part of both faculty and administration. On balance, it is clearly evident that an Advisory Panel of this kind can be a highly useful mechanism for insuring the success of a project and its accountability both to sponsors and the general public.

Evaluation

Struggling with the problems of evaluation during the past three years has produced a fairly sophisticated faculty at Austin College. Even under the best of conditions, evaluative research in the field of education has serious limitations because of the complex social context in which the research is carried out and the bewildering array of uncontrollable variables that can influence the outcome. The Office of Educational Research and Development at Austin College, though small in size, has developed an excellent capability for the measurement of student characteristics, the documentation of institutional processes, and the assessment of social change. The office has been exceedingly helpful to the Advisory Panel in providing information needed to understand many of the activities underway at Austin College. This capability should be maintained and even strengthened in the future in order to assess the delayed impact of the Total Institutional Project, as well as to monitor new programs as they develop.

A new grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation has been received by Austin College to aid in the development of a model for institutional self-renewal in connection with a nontraditional self-study for reaffirmation of regional accreditation. An emphasis on evaluation should continue as a part of program operations under this new grant.

Impact of the College Leadership Upon the Project.

The Advisory Panel never addressed itself in any systematic way to the impact of individual administrators and faculty members upon the Total Institutional Project. As in any major undertaking of this sort, the personalities, abilities, and roles of individual leaders in the institution have clearly played a decisive part in determining the outcome of the project.

Even a casual observer cannot help but be impressed by the determination and loyalty of the faculty in devoting themselves wholeheartedly to the many difficult tasks encountered in the project. To single out any specific individual would do an injustice to the many persons who played crucial roles in the implementation of the project. Nevertheless, one cannot help but be impressed by the strong leadership and persistence of the President, the personal, often charismatic leadership of the project director whose death last year is an irrevocable loss to the College, and the quiet, dependable administration of his co-director who has assumed full responsibility for the project since his death. The particular combinations of individuals and the roles they assumed at Austin College during the past three years deserve more careful study in order to gain a fuller understanding of the major forces affecting the outcome of the project.

SPECIFIC PROGRAM ELEMENTS

Over a dozen specific program elements have been isolated for special attention as significant features of the Total Institutional Project. For convenience of discussion, these can be divided roughly into five major areas as follows: (1) the substantive content of the curriculum; (2) personal development of the student; (3) educational technology and methods; (4) faculty development; and (5) organizational and institutional changes.

Substantive Content of the Curriculum.

Major efforts were devoted to the development of an integrated freshman year program with Communication/Inquiry and the beginning of a three-course series in the Heritage of Western Men as the core of the program. As ideally conceived, this interdisciplinary approach was intended to involve faculty from all areas of the College. In actual practice, however, the series on

the Heritage of Western Men was taught largely by faculty within the Humanities, most notably in History. The continuation of the series on the Heritage of Western Men into the second year was joined by the Policy Research course. In evaluating these core courses which were instituted to replace the traditional distributional requirements of a liberal arts education, one is struck by the great diversity among these courses in respect to their innovative qualities, their popularity among both faculty and students, their content and methods, and their relative success as measured by various methods.

Communication / Inquiry. This freshman core course is a somewhat novel form of an orientation course for entering freshmen. It is loose enough to allow innovation and variability of content to meet the interests of the students and the faculty. Too frequently, however, it is not taken seriously by either the students or the faculty. Many sections would appear to need more substance in their content in order to take full advantage of the innovation. One of the difficulties with the program as it now stands is that there is a great deal of uncertainty as to just what should be contained in the program. Some faculty members involved in the program are simply not properly trained for this type of teaching. Those who do participate in the program sacrifice a great deal in terms of the effort that they must devote to the Communication / Inquiry course at the expense of improved teaching in their own disciplines and in their more advanced professional activities. Quite clearly, the faculty in English, Speech, Psychology, and perhaps Education have a definite part in the program although it is unclear what significant role can be played by the faculty in the Natural Sciences and Mathematics. Communication / Inquiry is a course that can be a very useful vehicle for introducing freshmen to many new ideas, but it is obviously not

a course to be taught by every faculty member.

Heritage of Western Man. In spite of the ambitious interdisciplinary plan for this course as initially conceived, in most instances, the course is not appreciably different from core courses in Western Civilization as taught in many other colleges and universities. The first two courses in the sequence have not been highly popular with most students and often the faculty assigned to teach sections have done so reluctantly. The course needs wider participation, particularly from the sciences, if it is to realize its original objectives. It must be kept fresh and alive for the faculty by frequent change of some of the textbooks and by regular meetings of the staff to discuss ways in which the teaching can be more effective. Individual instances exist of outstanding teaching with innovative methods, to be sure, but in general the course can be improved considerably by further work. Several faculty members have already developed more effective learning strategies with the use of simulation games and modular methods that should be employed more widely.

Policy Research. In Policy Research, upperclass students and faculty bring the interests and expertise of different disciplines to a team effort to study a specific societal issue and to formulate public policy alternatives. Observations of the seminar in action under the director of the program reveal a liveliness of discussion, of student initiative, and of sophistication of inquiry that is indeed impressive. When properly handled, this program seems to stimulate a great deal of independence on the part of the participating students. The course is definitely innovative and should be continued. With the current cry for academic relevance, this course could be a smashing success. And yet, as revealed by the in-depth interviews, it has been sharply criticized by both faculty and students. Undoubtedly, the style of the

instructor and his skill in directing the seminar have a great deal to do with its success or failure. The particular topics chosen and the mixture of students present in the seminar may also be important variables. Because its success appears to be dependent upon two or three key faculty members, there are problems in keeping Policy Research alive -- the constant search for new topics, the broadening of faculty participation, the unevenness of student peer teaching in the various sections, and the problem of exhausting the community as a field of operation. In spite of these problems and criticism, however, this course should be retained as a part of the required curriculum for most students.

In summary, the core course program has been quite innovative and more successful than most such programs elsewhere in the country. Every part of the core needs greater breadth of participation and constant scrutiny to keep it alive. The faculty, above all, must feel that the College is genuinely interested in this program. Those who participate must feel that they are being rewarded for their efforts which are often contributed to the detriment of their specialized interests and professional advancement in a particular field.

Personal Development of the Student.

Tied in closely with the core curriculum for freshmen is a program aimed at the individual development of the students. The program is designed to personalize the faculty-student advisory system that can then be extended into the upper division of the College. Three elements of this program can be singled out for special attention -- the mentor role, the Birkman Personality Seminar, and the Career Counseling Program.

The Faculty Mentor Role. The student/mentor relationship begins in Communication /Inquiry, the first of six core courses. The faculty leader

becomes the mentor for a group of about 20 freshmen. Communication abilities, personal identity and values, and modes of intellectual inquiry are the foci of the course. Nearly all faculty participate in the mentor role with varying degrees of success. For those faculty members who are good counselors, this program is highly effective and provides a systematic approach to the individual advising of students. For faculty members who are unskillful or uncomfortable in this role of mentor, however, the faculty-student relationship may be strained and ineffective. Changes in procedures have been adopted for the 1975 fall term in order to overcome some of these problems. The program should be continued in revised form and periodically evaluated in order to improve it. Obviously, some faculty should not be serving as mentors while others should be fully recognized for their capabilities in this regard.

The Birkman Method and Seminar. Borrowed from industry, this technique involves the administration of a personality inventory and discussion of the results in a small group seminar under faculty leadership. Extensive changes have been made in the original Birkman Method as a result of early critical evaluations. While the method may have great potential value for some freshmen in providing a means to learn more about their own personalities and how their salient characteristics may affect others, for most individuals the method has not been sufficiently significant to justify its continuation. Both students and faculty were especially critical of the Birkman Seminar when interviewed. It may well be that the students have shifted somewhat in our current economic recession from worrying about psychological-attitudinal concerns to the practical instrumental concerns of what do I do when I graduate from Austin College.

Career Counseling and Articulation with Graduate and Professional Schools. Both students and faculty have become increasingly concerned about the career

orientation of students. The fierce competition to gain admission to graduate and professional schools and the recent economic recession have only exacerbated the problem, creating a sense of urgency on the part of most upper division students and many faculty. Since about one out of four students has expressed a desire to enter medical school, special advising is necessary for the majority of students who will not be able to gain admission under present highly competitive circumstances. More emphasis needs to be given to a career service office on campus and to the greater use of alumni who might be willing to provide intern training in special fields during summers and in the January interim period. Special symposia on careers in law, social service, industry, journalism, and other fields should be utilized more fully than they have been in the past. In short, the advice and concern for individual development should extend beyond the academic curriculum. The fact that Austin College is not in the mainstream of travel and is located in a small community adds to the disadvantage of graduates in finding employment.

Educational Technology and Methods

A major thrust of the entire project has been to individualize instruction and personalize the relationship between faculty and students so that each student could take full advantage of all the resources on the campus. A number of courses have been thoroughly revised to fit the radically different calendar and to take advantage of new instructional technology. Quite often necessity has proven to be the mother of invention. Three elements of the program deserve special mention -- student teachers and self-directed learning, interactive computing, and integration of educational technology.

Learning by Teaching and Self-Directed Learning. Nearly all of the juniors and seniors have had experience in one or more "learning-by-teaching" roles.

The new calendar, the development of self-paced, skill - development modules, and new ways for determining competencies and organizing laboratory discussion groups and large classes have all provided, with varying degrees of success, new kinds of learning experiences for students. Under the self-directed curriculum, the student may reduce the time it takes to complete a module or block of content. But the program is limited since it does not allow the student who may be a rapid learner to progress beyond the established time frame or the one who may be a slow learner to have more time to reach the stated objectives at his own rate. The program has been well received in some areas and deserves further effort to implement it on as broad a base as possible. Perhaps more than any other area, the new modern language program illustrates the promise of this approach. "Self-pacing" without time frames should also be considered and the faculty should be encouraged to write some "operational definitions" to guide them in developing new instructional modules.

Interactive Computing. Computer literacy training for all incoming freshmen takes place in the Communication/Inquiry course where students first receive a one-hour lecture, with slides. More advanced students then introduce the beginners to the elements of computer interaction. With surprisingly little capital investment in computer equipment, Austin College is successfully achieving a minimal level of computer literacy for all students. In addition, a small number of students are going far beyond this level by taking advantage of computer courses offered over the TAGER System. The faculty and staff associated with computing are well qualified and highly dedicated. With the help of students, they have stretched their resources to an impressive degree. It is apparent, however, that further improvements will require substantial financial investment. The College has already gone

a long way in this direction by acquiring a new computer system with greatly increased flexibility and power.

Integrating Technology. Individualizing instruction and placing renewed emphasis upon student-initiated learning rather than classroom teaching requires a greatly enlarged capacity for the integration of educational technology. The magnificent new Ida Green Communication Center , completed in 1972, provides a unique resource for developing and using educational technology. The Center encompasses simultaneous television transmission and receiving capabilities with the TAGER Green television network, the local television cable service, a local commercial television station, and closed-circuit distribution within the Center and for the Austin campus. Additions to the faculty and staff and the newly organized Department of Communication Arts are major steps in the right direction. The integration of educational technology and its applications to instruction and learning at Austin College are significant and impressive. To continue at the present level of commitment will require additional professional and technical personnel to teach, direct and maintain the educational excellence already begun. An expanded program of services continues to provide unique opportunities for the preprofessional preparation of students in the communication arts. The long-range plan for media use includes professional and technical personnel to work with the faculty in instructional development and curriculum design. To justify the use of expensive media resources, a faculty advisory committee should work closely with the director of media in determining priorities according to the clarity of specifications for the instruction, the particular techniques involved, and the necessary resources for production. The learning resources must be of high quality and must be effectively used if their cost to the College

is to be justified. Further strengthening of these areas should place Austin College in a commanding position of leadership in the effective large-scale integration of educational technology as a learning resource.

Faculty Development.

Recognizing that faculty development and self-renewal are essential to bring about lasting change in the total program, Austin College has made provision for several important developmental programs for the faculty themselves. Most notable among these efforts are the Summer Resource Laboratory, the Faculty Personnel Program, and concern for recognizing faculty achievements and evaluating faculty assignments. The Summer Resource Laboratory is the most outstanding success among these programs, the others having been initiated only recently and with mixed results.

Summer Resource Laboratory. Grant funds from the sponsoring agencies made it possible for Austin College to conduct summer resource laboratories each summer for both students and faculty. This six-week program provided extra income for selected faculty and special opportunities for both students and faculty to explore institutional and personal role changes and to develop new skills. The 1973 laboratory was organized specifically around groups concerned with the ways in which students learn and particular program elements. The introduction and use of computers, integration of films and related media, formulation of program objectives, student-paced learning in relation to time blocks and calendars, educational television, peer teaching, and one-to-one relationships including the mentor concept are just some of the learning modes introduced in these summer sessions. The 1974 and 1975 laboratories helped to maintain the momentum of the project and capitalized upon advances during the year. Faculty members, administrators, and participating students are nearly unanimous in their belief that the

Summer Resource Laboratory is a most crucial element of the Total Institutional Project. Every effort should be made to continue some form of laboratory for faculty self-renewal and for evaluation of the successes and failures during the year. In the future, such a program should also give special attention to the professional development of individual faculty members in their own area of specialty.

Faculty Personnel Program. Recognizing that diverse contributions to the total program at Austin College are made in different ways by different members of the faculty, the College has established a Faculty Personnel Program. While thus far the program has been of limited scope and success, the basic idea of working closely with each individual faculty member in planning for his own career is a good one. There appears to be some confusion among many faculty members who do not really understand the program well and are unable to come forward with a clear statement of their personal goals. While the program is perceived as having great potential and may be a key to maintaining faculty support in the future, it needs vigorous implementation and careful review with full faculty participation before it can succeed.

Evaluation of Assignments and Faculty Reward System. The many new activities and roles for faculty members under the Total Institutional Project have resulted in a breakdown of the simpler traditional departmental lines of authority and the accompanying system for recognition of faculty achievement. Rather belatedly, the administration recognized the major changes occurring and has now made an effort to evaluate assignments and to cope with the problems in recognizing faculty achievement. Midway in the project, it was apparent that many faculty members were overworked in non-traditional ways that were not clearly recognized or rewarded. Faculty members need senior colleagues with whom they can relate closely, a strength

of the old departmental structure that has not yet been adequately replaced in the new organization. The complex matrix approach to categorizing and recognizing both structure and function has not yet been fully accepted by the faculty. Clearly, the current system by which the program chairmen and committee members are assigned responsibilities and recognized for achievement can be improved. In the future, it will not be easy to provide differential financial rewards to faculty members for outstanding teaching and other recognized contributions. One type of recognition which can be given even where financial rewards are not possible is to make certain that senior administrators and faculty colleagues personally recognize a job well done by an individual faculty member. Unfortunately, such personal recognition and acclaim is too seldom built-in as part of an academic reward system. Over the past three years, most of the faculty at Austin College have demonstrated a high degree of personal commitment to their work in spite of the fact that rewards have not always been forthcoming. The next year or two is a crucial time in which to pay special attention to appropriate faculty recognition and reward; otherwise, the letdown following completion of the Total Institutional Project could grow into apathy and bitterness.

Organizational and Institutional Changes.

A major purpose of the Total Institutional Project was to introduce simultaneously enough new program elements to produce a critical mass of change, resulting in a new level of effectiveness as a college. Such massive changes could hardly be undertaken without accompanying reorganization and institutional change. While the president, the dean, major divisional heads and areas of concentration still remain as the general structure of the College, a number of changes have been implemented that are likely to be relatively permanent. The number of committees involving faculty and students

has increased greatly in order to involve the entire community in the many new activities under the Total Institutional Project. The organization has gotten sufficiently complicated that a large matrix is necessary to show the faculty involvement in college-wide programs. One dimension of the matrix is traditional and contains the disciplinary "homebase" of the faculty member in the humanities, the sciences, or social sciences. The other dimension involves program units, many of which are new as a result of the Total Institutional Project. Program managers are designated for these units, resulting in multiple roles for many faculty and administrators.

This reorganization of the College has stripped away the traditional lines of authority and responsibility, creating new opportunities for motivating individual participants in the program. As a result, there does not seem to be a governing council among the faculty in which the faculty themselves feel that they are able to participate in a fully responsive manner. Many faculty have the feeling that they are rather powerless in the current governance of the College. The flow of communication is generally perceived as moving from the provost down rather than in the other direction. As the College consolidates its gains of the past three years and achieves some stability in the coming months, provision will have to be made for an effective governing council in which the faculty themselves participate.

In an effort to deal with the problems of management and accountability, a new program management system is being developed. Aimed at combining faculty participation with accountability through decentralization of program management, this new system was just being established as the Total Institutional Project came to an end. Consequently, it is too early to judge the effectiveness of this new management plan. Initially, however, some difficulties have been encountered because the term "management" has a number of

negative connotations difficult to overcome in a faculty setting. The overall objectives of the program management system are to achieve better utilization of resources while accomplishing educational program objectives in the most humane, effective, and economical way possible. At this initial stage in the development of the program, some faculty members are very suspicious and skeptical of its value. Obviously, it will take a great deal of open discussion and flexible adaptation before the program is accepted with any enthusiasm by the College community. Nevertheless, its objectives are important and every effort should be made to develop a successful management plan.

The lines of reorganization and institutional change will become much clearer in the coming months. The recently obtained grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation will provide essential financial support to underwrite the further development of this program management system.

Related to the reorganization are the major changes in the academic calendar that have been an integral part of the Total Institutional Project. The 2-2-1-4 calendar has forced the faculty to restructure the entire curriculum and to search for new kinds of instructional strategies. While there are definite advantages in the new calendar which allows short periods of time for concentration on a limited number of topics, the new calendar also carries with it disadvantages for those courses in which a longer term of exposure is essential. There is obviously no ideal calendar as shown by the wide variety that are currently in existence across the country. Now that the College has adapted fairly well to the new calendar, it would be better to make minor flexible adjustments in the current calendar than to undergo an additional drastic change. The current calendar has been in effect for too short a duration for any final judgement concerning its worth.

The short January term of one month has been used as a brief period for world tours , rest and relaxation as well as intensive study in a single area. While such varied activities have a certain merit, continuation of the short January term should stand or fall on the extent to which it contributes to the academic enterprise.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

It is apparent to the entire Advisory Panel that Austin College has made tremendous strides in its own academic program during the past several years and has successfully undertaken some very significant innovations. It is unlikely that these program elements would have been successful if they had been attempted in isolation from each other, testifying the validity of the fundamental notion behind the Total Institutional Project. The modest kinds of limited evaluation that were built into the program were sufficient to provide good information about why different program elements succeeded or failed. While no scientifically rigorous evaluation has been undertaken concerning the impact of the program upon student learning, faculty development, or institutional organization, even a casual observer cannot help but be impressed by the depth and variety of innovations that have been seriously introduced. As noted above, many of these have become a permanent part of the institution, while others have fallen by the wayside. The years to come will be crucial in determining the extent to which Austin College can maintain a higher level of enthusiasm and vigorous self-renewal. Undertaking a program of this magnitude must surely exhaust the faculty and administration, requiring a relatively quiet period of consolidation before renewed efforts to achieve new levels of excellence can be successfully mounted.

A second challenge facing the College will be to return to the business of educating students without the major stimulus that has come from a very large amount of federal support over the past three years. It remains to be seen whether or not the College can continue to be innovative at a high level of quality while living within its own somewhat limited budget.

The College will have to make special efforts to walk the narrow line between rigidity and flexibility. Because so much of the work over the past several years has been successful, these aspects of the current program should not be changed again until subsequent evaluation indicates that a new approach should be taken. At the same time, the College cannot afford to convert its program to a kind of religion, thus seeking to endow it with both orthodoxy and immortality. Despite its Presbyterian heritage, Austin College does not have a built-in constituency in sufficient proportion to insure that all seats will be filled. Thus it becomes all the more important that the College keep testing its goals and programmatic concepts against the changing realities of its own marketplace.

Without exception, the members of the Advisory Panel regret that the Total Institutional Project is coming to an end, if for no other reason than the intellectual excitement and enjoyment of interacting with the College during meetings of the Advisory Panel.